

## Interview Summary

Application No.

08/946,138

Applicant(s)

Albrecht et al.

Examiner

Kenneth R. Horlick

Group Art Unit 1634



All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):
(1) Kenneth R. Horlick (3)
(2) Stephen Macevicz (4)
Date of Interview Nov 12, 1998
Type: 🛚 Telephonic 🗀 Personal (copy is given to 🗀 applicant 🗀 applicant's representative).
Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted:   Yes  No. If yes, brief description:
Agreement   was reached.   was not reached.
Claim(s) discussed: pending
Identification of prior art discussed:  Brenner patents '675 and '097
intends to highlight the differences in the next response.
(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments, if available, which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendents which would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)
1.   It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview.
Unless the paragraph above has been checked to indicate to the contrary, A FORMAL WRITTEN RESPONSE TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION IS NOT WAIVED AND MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a response to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN ONE MONTH FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW.
2. Since the Examiner's interview summary above (including any attachments) reflects a complete response to each of the objections, rejections and requirements that may be present in the last Office action, and since the claims are now allowable, this completed form is considered to fulfill the response requirements of the last Office action. Applicant is not relieved from providing a separate record of the interview unless box 1 above is also checked.
Examiner Note: You must sign and stamp this form unless it is an attachment to a signed Office action.